THEOLOGY

VOL. L SEPTEMBER, 1947 No. 327

Notice

THE Editor will be sailing for the U.S.A. on September 26 in order to deliver the Hale Lectures and to fulfil other engagements, and will not be back till early in December. Professor Norman Sykes has kindly undertaken to see THEOLOGY to press during the Editor's absence and to attend to any necessary correspondence. MSS may also be sent to him, but it is not promised that a decision will be reached with regard to them before the Editor's return. From September 23 to November 30, therefore, editorial communications should be addressed to the Rev. Prof. N. Sykes, 2, Selwyn Gardens, Cambridge.

Editorial

THE Church of England has reason to be grateful to the Archbishops' Commission on Canon Law for its Report and to the publishers for producing it in such a handsome form.[1] The historical part of the Report could hardly have been better done, and it will stand as an indispensable introduction to the subject, whatever conclusion may be reached about the proposals which the Commission has made for a revised body of canons. Even if the conclusion be that it is not at present either desirable or practicable to give legislative effect to these proposals, the proposals themselves will nevertheless have cleared the air and have made possible a decision whether or no the time is ripe for the Church of England to put this part of its house in order. Without such definite proposals, the question could never have come to a head.

Prima facie the case for carrying through with the least possible delay a thorough revision of the canon law seems to be strong. It rests upon these considerations: the long time that has elapsed since any similar attempt was made and the great changes that have meanwhile taken place in the Church and in society, the confusion that now exists concerning what the law of the Church of England is, and the advantages that might accrue from the provision of conditions which would both permit and require plain obedience to authority. Yet now that these proposals are before us, we are by no means convinced that the time is ripe for what the Commissioners recommend.

To a large extent, the proposed body of canons simply (though not always simply) states what is by common consent the contemporary custom of the Church. Such a statement is useful, whether or no legislative effect is given to it. Would anything substantial be gained if it were given legislative effect? We doubt it. As it is, it will serve as a convenient record of, and guide to, the living practice of the Church. If an attempt were made to pass into law those of the proposed canons which already have common consent behind them, the result might

[1] So handsome in fact that, we are told, some unwary readers have supposed that the Report must already have received official sanction.

be only to give cavilling minds, which ought to be better occupied an opportunity to raise ingenious disputes and to initiate long debates about trivial details.

On the other hand, there is a considerable number of the proposed canons—and they are probably those upon which the Commission bestowed most thought—which, so far from stating what is already accepted or customary, are designed to introduce changes into the practice, if not into the teaching, of the Church of England. Such, for example, are the canons that deal with the relations between the Church of England and other churches or denominations, with the ministration of holy baptism, with the law of the Church about marriage, and with the Church Courts. A revised body of canons which ignored these important subjects, would be fantastic; it would be a truncated body. We do not object to canons of this kind merely because they are contentious or because the attempt to pass them would give rise to controversy. What we question is whether the time is ripe for legislating about these matters *en bloc*.

At the back of the canons to which we are alluding are theological principles concerning which it is notorious or it ought to be notorious that convictions in the Church of England are deeply divided or at least not yet ready to be brought into harmony. There is the question of the nature of the unity of the Church Universal and of the true way to its restoration; there is the question of the relation between baptism and confirmation and the true pattern of Christian initiation; there is the question of the Christian doctrine of marriage and its application to a "post-Christian" society; there is the question of the relation between the Church and the State under twentieth-century conditions and the involved principle of the Royal Supremacy. We want to see these questions weighed and studied in all their bearings not only by professional theologians but throughout the Church. They affect every member of the Church, whether he is aware of the fact or not. We see no reason why answers to them should not eventually be reached by common consent. But more harm than good would be done by any endeavour to press through new legislation on these subjects before both the clergy and the laity as a whole have been convinced that it is right and have a sufficient understanding of the principles on which it is grounded. "All changes in England," said Walter Bagehot, "should be made slowly and after long discussion. Public opinion should be permitted to ripen upon them."[1] While this is too sweeping a generalization, it does apply here. The time for the introduction of a revised body of canons is not yet, and will not be in the proximate future. *Canon Law in the Church of England* may paradoxically serve to bring it nearer, provided that the principal recommendation of the Commission is not accepted.

Some of these controversial matters may indeed require early ecclesiastical legislation, notably marriage and divorce, but if so it should be of an interim or *ad hoc* kind. On the other hand, the discovery of the right way of ordering Christian initiation needs to be set forward for a long time by patient theological investigation and

[1] See *Life of Walter Bagehot*, by Mrs Russell Barrington (1914), p. 14.

imaginative pastoral care and experiment. It would be a fatal mistake to try to anticipate the conclusion of this process by the early imposition of undigested and untried laws.

The truth is that the Church of England is not now in a period of theological or social stability but in a period of theological upheaval and incalculable social change. There could scarcely be a less suitable moment for attempting to stabilize its law. The time for doing that will, please God, come in due course; but by then so much will have changed that even if there were any likelihood of this proposed body of canons being passed the whole task would have to be undertaken *de novo*.

We may expect, too, that by then there will be a larger body of trained canonists in the Church and a wider appreciation of the importance of canon law. For we may all agree that specialization in this subject should be encouraged, and also that *Canon Law in the Church of England* should forthwith be accorded the status of a textbook in our theological colleges. Moreover, we may expect that by then the Church of England's mode of legislation and self-government will have been simplified by a fusion between the Convocations and the Church Assembly and will have been strengthened by the acknowledgment that, as in other parts of the Anglican Communion, the laity have a right to be represented in the legislative and governing organs of the Church. The present legislative and governing institutions of the Church of England are not only retrograde (unless indeed it be held that the other provinces of the Anglican Communion ought to expel laymen from their provincial and diocesan synods), but also intolerably cumbrous. Alluding to this, Archbishop Lang, who was accustomed to weigh his words, spoke in 1941 of "the enormous difficulties of getting things done in the existing system." "I could enlarge on that theme with the most pathetic eloquence," he said, "two Houses, two Convocations, each House and each Convocation jealous of its own independence and of its own rights and privileges, and both Houses and the two Convocations extremely sensitive on all these matters. The fact that they meet very seldom and meet separately makes the conduct of the business of the Church of England almost impossible."[1]

The Report of the Canon Law Commission has nothing to suggest at this point, and in fact turns a blind eye upon the topic. We suggest that before an attempt is made to carry through a revised body of canons the Church's legislative organs be overhauled and reconstructed. It will be much better at the present time for the subject-matter of the more important of the proposed canons to be studied and discussed by ruridecanal chapters and parochial church councils than for the whole code to be caught up in the intricate machinery of the unreformed Convocations.

Our suggestions are therefore (1) that the actual revision of the canon law should be postponed *sine die*, and meanwhile (2) that the Church's legislative organs should be reformed, and (3) that the study of canon law in general and of *Canon Law in the Church of England* in particular should be promoted in every possible way so as to prepare the ground for the time when a new code can be promulgated.

[1] *Chronicle of Convocation* (May 28th, 1941), pp. 99 *f*.

Canon Law in the Church of England—II

We shall misinterpret the later history of the Reformation unless we read it in the constitutional setting which I have tried to sketch. It was an ecclesiastical struggle, fought within the constitution of the realm. The issue lay between Puritans on the one side, and Conservatives or Catholics on the other; but the Puritans captured the Commons, and the Conservatives, through the Bishops, leaned upon the Crown. When King and Commons quarrelled, the alliances stood firm. The Convocations were compromised in the prerogative: they enacted canons with the royal assent, they secured, or were obliged to execute, Commissions and Injunctions Royal, binding the Puritans to a conformity they abhorred. The Puritans were entrenched in the Commons, and the Commons determined to bring the prerogative down. The Convocations, and the Canons, were involved in its fall. This is the complex in which we have to trace the history of canon law from 1534 to 1640, and thence to 1661 and 1736.

"Accustomed and Used."—Chapter IV of the *Report* prepares the ground for the Commission's answer to Question A, 1*a*, on "the present status of Canon Law in England as regards canons in force before the Reformation." The intention embodied in the Act of Submission (25 Henry VIII, cap. 19, 1534), to review and revise the old canon law by a royal commission of thirty-two, was never properly fulfilled. The project was frequently the subject of discussion and petition until 1563; it seemed to be near fulfilment in 1571, when Foxe published the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, the code compiled by commissioners under a new Act of 1550 (3 and 4 Ed. VI, cap. 11), as revised first by Cranmer and then by Parker. The code received no authority from the Convocations, from the Queen, or from Parliament. It was reprinted in 1640 and again in 1641, when the plan "for the purging of the ecclesiastical laws and the squaring of them to the common laws of the realm" was last considered, and again abandoned.[1] The failure is more important for us than a success. For until that Commission had done its work, all "canons constitutions, ordinances, and synodals provincial being already made which (were) not contrariant or repugnant to the laws, statutes, and customs of this realm, nor to the damage or hurt of the king's prerogative royal" were to continue in force as they were before the making of the Act.

This clause, with the further addition, in the Act of 1543, of "other Ecclesiastical Laws or Jurisdictions Spiritual, as be yet accustomed and used here in the Church of England," added, in the words of Gibson, "a *Parliamentary* Authority or *Enaction* to all *our own* Canons and Constitutions . . . not repugnant," as the first clause of the Act concerning Peter-Pence and Dispensation "was a Recognition of the Authority of the *foreign* Canon Law in the Nation, upon the foot of *Usage* and *Custom*."[2]

[1] See Part I in Theology, August, 1947, p. 293, n. 1.

[2] *Codex* ii, p. 947. The statutes are 35 Henry VIII, cap. 16; 25 Henry VIII, cap. 21.

The medieval canon law, then, papal and domestic, was carried ver on the strength of enactment and custom: it became the ground n which the modern ecclesiastical law was built. Some has been re-nforced by subsequent canon, statute, and judicial ruling; some has ontinued in force by custom, without any such aid; other has been brogated by canon and statute, and by desuetude as properly de-ned.

It will be recognized at once that a system of law so bound up ith custom depends much upon tradition for its interpretation. his fourth chapter of the *Report* traces that tradition, a narrowing ream, through the history of legal practice. Henry VIII abolished e study of canon law in the Universities, and by statute (35 enry VIII, cap. 17) enabled doctors in civil law, even married and nordained, to exercise his ecclesiastical jurisdiction as officers in the clesiastical courts. There was already an affinity between civilians d canonists, as there was between the two laws; so for a long time e tradition of the canon law was safe in the civilians' keeping; it as handed down within the society of Doctors' Commons, the llege of judges and advocates practising in the spiritual courts. octors' Commons suffered the degeneracy which has overcome any closed and self-governing corporations, and was suppressed in 857, but the tradition was already lost. The ritualistic controversies the nineteenth century gained in ferocity because Churchmen had o trust in the theological competence of lawyers[1] and lawyers had o better opinion of the legal sense of Churchmen.[2] It is to recap-ure this tradition of canonical jurisprudence that the Commission ecommends the formation of a new society for canonical studies, ith clergymen and theologians as well as historians and lawyers mong its members. There is nothing in law to prevent clergymen om becoming Chancellors—Mr Gladstone, indeed, once expressed e hope that they would, "when they are educated for it hereafter"[3] —and the title-page to Burn's *Ecclesiastical Law* is a testimony to hat a clergyman-chancellor has achieved. But it is doubtful whether, ithout a scientific legal training, he could accomplish as much oday. Custom plays a far greater part in canon law than it does in e common law: its power to acquire the force of law, or, alterna-vely, to abrogate existing law, is necessary to life in an organic ody like the Church, which must continually be adapting itself to anging situations. But it must be custom juridically tested and pplied, according to known traditional principles, or the common

[1] See, *e.g.*, Bishop Blomfield, speaking in the Lords, June 3rd, 1850: "In all atters requiring judicial acuteness and calmness, impartiality and firmness, the discovery of the truth of facts, and for the explanation and application the law, nothing more (*sc.* than the Judicial Committee) is to be desired. is only when questions of doctrine arise, and points of faith are to be deter-ined that I object to that tribunal as incompetent." (*Memoir of Bishop omfield*, by A. Blomfield [1863], ii, p. 129.)

[2] *E.g.*, a Peer of the Realm in the same House, 1874: "Convocation, my rds, convocation is all fudge." (*Archibald Campbell Tait*, ii, p. 188.)

[3] *Life of Samuel Wilberforce*, 3 vols. (1880-82), ii, p. 289.

life of the Church will be broken up by individual preference, ar thence its unity, its charity, its peace, will be impaired.

If this section of the *Report* is understood, the answer to the que tion on the status of the pre-Reformation canon law will be clea Canons enforced by later statute, as many have been, present r difficulty: they bind with double force; modern textbooks of eccl siastical law, like *Cripps on Church and Clergy*, quote Lyndwoo alongside of post-Reformation statutes and cases as of equal authorit Sections of the canon law modified or abrogated by statute fall in two sorts. Some have been modified or abrogated also by the Churc by its overt approval or tacit consent; others the Church has declin to amend, and these persist in binding Church people in oppositio to the statute law. Sections concerning which there has been no su sequent legislation are again of two sorts. Some which were in for at the Reformation and have continued in force ever since are st fully operative and enforceable; others have fallen into desuetud and can be enforced no longer. The judge of whether custom or n custom is not any individual, but the canonist with the necessa skill and knowledge, duly authorized to interpret and declare t law.

Canons since the Reformation.—The making of new canons m with little better success than the plan for revising the old. Indee it is not until the close of Elizabeth's reign that the constitutio position of the bishops and Convocations becomes recognizable normative at all. The even passage of the nation upon two win spiritualty and temporalty, provided for in the Act of Submissio became an erratic, perilous course, as the wings beat out of time, one was numbed, or plumed, or broken. The responsibility for t must lie between the tyranny of the Council, established on t weakness of King Edward VI, and the existence among the bisho of the very dissensions the Church most needed them to heal. Eli beth, it is true, kept the Commons in their place, but through her reign the Church was governed by a medley of Injunctio royal and episcopal, Articles and Advertisements, Letters, Ord and Proclamations. Canons were framed several times, but none ceived the necessary consents—of the Upper House, the Lo House, and then of the Queen—until 1597. It was to give cohere to this confusion of laws that Bishop Bancroft and his three ass ants from Doctors' Commons framed, and had promulgated, the canons of 1603-4. Amendments have been made from time to tin the last was to Canon XCIX, the Table of Kindred and Affinity 1946; and two other canons have been added. But these apart, canons of 1603 have remained the authorized code for the gov ment of the Church of England down to our own day.

The Commission has been realistic enough to claim no l authority for the canons of 1640, which were passed by the Conv tion after the Short Parliament had been dissolved. The High Chu tenacity to them, revived, for example, by Lathbury and by historians of the Tractarian school, could never be sustained in of their specific exception from the operation of the statute of 1

3 Car. II, cap. 12, and their exclusion from the cognizance of the urts. Convocation was itself doubtful about the validity of the rocedure at the time, and fortified itself with the judgment of ven justices, and with a new Royal Writ which continued its session luring pleasure," before it enacted the canons. Nevertheless, the ispute raised has a present constitutional interest: Joseph Hall, en Bishop of Exeter, spoke in defence of the canons in the House Lords, and after pleading with skill that

> was our obedience, that both assembled and kept us together, for the making Synodical Acts. We had the Great Seal of England for it; seconded by the dgments of the oracles of law and justice; and, upon these, the command of r superior, to whom we have sworn and owe canonical obedience,

went on to enunciate this doctrine:

> Fourthly, give me leave to urge the authority of these Canons. In which gard, if I might without offence speak it, I might say that the complainants ve not, under correction, laid a right ground of their accusation. They say made Canons and Constitutions: alas! my Lords, we have made none. We ither did nor could make Canons, more than they can make laws. The Canons e so to the Church, as Laws are for the Commonwealth. Now they do but *gare legem*: they do not *ferre* or *sancire legem*; that is only for the King to : it is *le roi le veut*, that of Bills makes Laws. So was it for us to do in matter Canons: we might propound some such Constitutions, as we should think ight be useful: but, when we have done, we send to His Majesty; who, rusing them *cum avisamento Consilii sui*, and approving them, puts life into em, and of dead propositions makes them Canons. As, therefore, the laws are e King's laws, and not ours, so are the Canons the King's Canons, and not e Clergy's. Think thus of them; and then draw what conclusions you please.[1]

There could scarcely be a clearer statement made of the tradition in hich legislation by canon stands; the Church may not consistently ke advantage of the constitutional procedure while ignoring the nstitutional doctrine on which it rests. The Archbishop of York, the masterly address with which he introduced the *Report* to the orthern Convocation, made a statement which, closely guarded as appears to be, comes perilously near this contradiction: "The anons of the Church are only binding on those who are its embers; they have not been enacted by the State, though sometimes, as in our own case, State sanction is required for them."[2] My bmission is that those who are ashamed (as I am not ashamed) of State authority" for the government of the Church, cannot avoid by reverting to legislation in Convocation. There is in fact othing to choose, in point of state authority, between a Measure of e Church Assembly, submitted entire to the King after resolutions Parliament, and a Canon of Convocation, to which the King ould not assent against the advice of his ministers, except that the ne takes cognizance of four centuries' development of constitutional overnment and the other does not. And in point of spiritual uthority, the almost universal use of the provinces of the Anglican ommunion throughout the world would suggest that a synod

[1] *Works*, in twelve volumes, Oxford, 1837, viii, pp. 491 *ff.*
[2] *The Guardian*, May 23rd, 1947.

which includes a House of Laity is accepted to be more truly "th true Church of —— by Representation" than one which does not It may be thought prudent to keep both channels open in case som day they may be needed: but let us at least keep the facts of the constitution clear, and the vision of "spiritual liberty" unclouded b false antitheses.

The Restoration, then, found the Church with only the canons o 1603; between 1661 and 1717 some new canons were discussed, an amendments to some old ones were drawn, but there was no pr mulgation. The Convocations did not meet for business from 166 to 1689, and in 1717 their internal quarrels brought them again int abeyance, from which they did not emerge, except in 1741, unt 1852. There is more behind that story than we can stay to tell; an there is wholesome cautionary reading in it for any proctor gifte with a "procedure" mind. The present authority of the canons o 1603 is determined formally by Lord Hardwicke's judgment of 173 which was itself the direct outcome of the constitutional develo ment we have been tracing. The campaign of deprivation directe by Bancroft and the Council against Puritans refusing to make th declarations demanded by the new canons, raised at once the que tion of their validity. Pamphleteers hinted that they were illeg because not confirmed by Parliament, and furnished the depriv with cases they might argue in their own defence in the comm law courts. The bishops relied on the Prerogative and the Hig Commission to defeat the attack through the common law, and o their position in the Lords to repel petition through the Commo The King's justices declared that "they held it clear that the Ki without Parliament might make orders and Constitutions for government of ye clergie and might deprive them if they obey not, and so the Commissioners might deprive them."[2] But in 16 the High Commission and the sitting of bishops in the Lords we both near, the one its end, the other its suspension; nor was a action of the King "without Parliament," ecclesiastical or civ likely to pass unchallenged. Canons would be authorized by t King *in* Parliament, or not at all; and this doctrine was confirm as we have seen, in 1661. Lord Hardwicke's judgment, quoted pp. 76-77 of the *Report*, was the next and consequent step: t canons of 1603, not having been confirmed by Parliament, do n *proprio vigore*—that is, by their own force and authority—bind t laity; but the provisions in them which declare the ancient us

[1] Among the Constitutions described by Archbishop Henry Lowther Cla in his *Constitutional Church Government* (S.P.C.K., 1924), only in the E copal Church of Scotland and in the West Indies is there a Provincial Sy without representation of the laity. In the West Indies this is on accoun the distances between the dioceses; nevertheless, acts of the Provincial Sy are not operative in any diocese which they concern until they have recei the concurrence of the Diocesan Synod, in which the laity are represen (p. 262 *f.*). In the Diocese of Zanzibar there is no lay representation in Diocesan Synod (p. 411).

[2] R. G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, 2 vols., 1910 p. 420.

nd law of the Church of England, received and allowed here, do, s "an obligation antecedent to, and not arising from, this body of anons." This is still the position for the laity (not being officers in he ecclesiastical courts) today. Whether it was so in the early years fter 1603 an examination of the records of the ecclesiastical courts ould tell: but certainly the judgment was in accordance with the ater developed constitutional theory of the relations of King and arliament. Upon the clergy the canons are binding *proprio vigore* n spiritual matters, but in temporal matters only so far as they are eclaratory of the earlier law of the realm. And thus the Commis- ion answers Question I under Section A. It will be recognized at nce that the sorting of what is declaratory of ancient usage and w from what is new in the canons is a task which only the lawyer nd the historian can perform.

If this narration in constitutional terms be thought tedious, or rrelevant, or (as some may say) Erastian, let this be considered: rom the day a lawgiver is converted to the Faith he will seek to mbody the applications of the Faith in his laws, and on that day he establishment of a national church begins. The Church lives ithin secular society, develops with it, and cannot exist apart from t. The Church will either mould society or be moulded by it—at imes one, at times the other. If in the days of her vigour the Church as embedded herself deeply within the constitutional frame, her eril is great in the days of her feebleness: suffocation may bring er near to death. But that is no reason why she should draw up her oots and cast the constitution off. Rather should she hold her round and seek new power where she teaches it is given; and then, f it is granted her, lead even captivity captive to her King. It is ecessary, therefore, if it is tedious, to take stock of our Prætorium.

The Proposed Canons.—The Commission's answer to Question 2, and the reasons for its rejection of any suggestion of making an nglish *Codex Juris Canonici*, are by this time well known: I need ay nothing of them, save that no one with any understanding of he task is likely to question the decision. I pass to some comment n the canons proposed. There are 134 in all, divided into eight hapters. They are modelled on the canons of 1603, which they are ntended to replace. They declare the designation of the Church of ngland, its status in relation to the true and Apostolical Church of hrist, and to the King and the laws of the realm; the formularies n which its doctrine, order, worship, and discipline are expressed; nd the law and custom by which its life is governed. Many of them mbody the ancient law of the Church, as it has been amended up o this time; some adopt recent resolutions of the Convocations for he regulation of new activities and institutions in the Church; ome validate existing and hitherto unauthorized custom; some ake entirely new provision for the future. The canons are de- cribed, with reference to their source, origin, application, and urpose, in Chapter VII of the *Report*.

The sense in which they are to be taken as law is defined in anons VII, VIII, and IX: they are to bind and to be enforceable

against the clergy and members of the laity holding office or clain ing the benefit of the ministrations of the Church; penalties are pr vided against clergymen and laymen guilty of disobedience to then The procedure for their validation in order that they may be "ce tainly operative" in the Church is discussed at page 82 of the *Repor* in the answer to question A2: and the chairman of the Commissio expanded this statement in his speech to the York Convocation:

"Some of the Canons, especially those which concern the laity, must be co sidered by the Church Assembly, and probably for over thirty of these Measure will be required. But that day is a long way off. The Convocatio must first make up their mind as to what they want: I hope in so doing the will not be unduly influenced by the thought of what Parliament may, or ma not, accept."[1]

If it is proposed to carve up the Code, and sometimes the canon and clauses of canons, into what does and does not concern th laity, in order to determine what must be considered by the Churc Assembly and what must not, the undertaking—heed Portia here— may well prove fatal to the plan. And how does the distinction stan in relation to the doctrine of the unity of the Body? The revival o the Convocations was attended by serious agitation for lay repr sentation at the highest level: the design of the eighteen-fifties wa almost realized in the setting up of the Church Assembly in 1919— almost, for the Convocations, although part of the Assembly, pr served their identity in distinction from it, and saved their legisl tive power. The attempt to enact these canons may well try th action, of what sort it was. Furthermore, His Grace's mild disdai of Parliament has in it, if I may say so, less of realism than of spirit if these canons are not to receive constitutional enactment then th whole labour of producing a *Report* in terms of history and law w vain: the future and the past are one. The proposed Courts alon which the Commission regards as "essential" to the enforcement the whole Code, cannot be set up without Parliament.

The language of the canons I am not competent to criticize ve far. But someone ought to do it, for there are places in which does not ring true. Did the Commission once hear them read aloud The style of 1603, which is necessarily dominant, sets an exacti standard for the modern draftsman. We have lost, for instance, "t youth of the parish," which sufficed in 1550 and 1603, and gain "the young people" (Canons XXXIV, LXXXIV)—a phrase not f removed from that sort of simpleton's English which has appear of late on parochial notice boards and in parish magazines. Arch isms, it is claimed, have been purged: yet a *bason* is retained for t alms, in Canon XCVIII; and under *bason* in the *Oxford Engli Dictionary* this definition first takes the eye:

"A bench with a plate of iron or stone flag fitted in it, and a little fire unc neath, on which (before the introduction of machinery) the first part of felting process (of *hat-making*) was performed."

If we must have this receptacle, we might at least spell it with an

[1] *The Guardian*, May 30th, 1947.

In the substance of the canons there is material for more serious discussion. It is right that a canon should be framed which takes cognizance of the scandal of disunion; Canon XI, therefore (*Cf. Schisms and Divisions in the Church*), after a lengthy preamble, enables a bishop to permit an interchange of preachers on three specified types of occasions (all of them outside the normal life of most congregations), or otherwise for the promotion of unity at the bishop's discretion. It admits Nonconformists to take part in informal services of prayer in parish churches. It makes no mention of intercommunion; intercommunion is being practised, sometimes judiciously, sometimes injudiciously, but without proper authority. Is this not a matter serious enough for regulation by canon—as serious, say, as *The Sign of the Cross in Baptism* (Canon XXXIII) which was a burning issue in 1603, but is so, as far as one can tell, no longer) or the washing of the vicar's surplice (Canon XVII)? Intercommunion is forbidden by implication by the rubric from the Confirmation Office, quoted in Canon XXI. The silence of Canon XI, therefore, is prohibitive: a canon regulative would, I suggest, be of more use to the Church today. In his Cambridge University sermon, the Archbishop of Canterbury advocated "a movement towards a free and unfettered exchange of life in worship and sacrament"; the silence of Canon XI allows no movement at all: it leaves us precisely where we are. It may be argued that defect of confirmation debars from admission to the Holy Communion in a way it does not from hearing sermons, and the Confirmation rubric may be quoted in support of that view. But the very exception in that rubric, "or be ready and desirous to be confirmed," amply supported as it is in Lyndwood at the page quoted (p. 40, gl. ad v. *impeditus*), is proof enough that the Church of England, rightly or wrongly, accepts the late Western tradition that Confirmation is not essential, as a *sine qua non*, to admission to the Holy Communion, in the sense that Baptism is. While our formularies, in fact, distinguish between Baptism as a Sacrament "ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel" and Confirmation as one of "those five, commonly called Sacraments . . . (which) are not to be counted as Sacraments of the Gospel (and) have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God" (Art. XXV), she is at liberty to treat the rule of confirmation before Communion as a part of the discipline which, as a national church, she has authority to change, "so that all things be done to edifying" (Art. XXXIV). There are theologians who deprecate the distinction, but their opinion has not yet changed our formularies. I submit, therefore, that a canon permitting, under regulation, intercommunion between baptized persons would be lawful, and is as necessary in the interest of reunion as the permitted interchange of preachers. On the same ground of lawfulness and necessity—and, indeed, of conformity with pre-Tractarian Anglican tradition—I would advocate a canon giving effect to Resolution 42 of the Lambeth Conference of 1930, admitting to the Communion members of Reformed Churches from abroad. At the present time Lutheran pastors, guests of the Church in this country, are admitted

to the Communion in some places and not admitted in others, a irregularity which is scandalous in the severest sense of the word.

Canon XX contains a section which is at variance with a para graph on p. 88 of the *Report* on the nature and function of law Canons, we are told, are laws, and "a law does not exhort, or re commend, or point to an ideal, or contain vague directions. A law commands or forbids people to do something and contains sanction to be imposed in case of disobedience." Now in Canon XX it i commanded that the Minister of the Parish, in his church, morning and evening, shall say or sing the Common Prayers, "remembering that it is one great part of the office of a Minister to praise and worship God not only in his own name but in the name of other also . . ." (and so on). A law commanding Ministers to remember al that, every morning and evening, as they read Mattins and Even song, may prove hard to enforce. If the Commission wishes t "recommend" this doctrine, or to point to its remembrance as "a ideal," *forasmuch as* would introduce the clause more satisfactorily But in fact the clause is clumsily worded—*it is one great part of th office of a Minister* is weak—and this vicarious ideal, important a it is, ought not to have such emphasis as would exclude the ideal c the Book of Common Prayer, "that the people may come to hea God's Word, and to pray with" the Minister.[1]

Canon XXIV (*Of the Receiving of Holy Communion*) has in § an ambiguity which may cause trouble. What is meant by the phras "and all other due preparation"? The canonist will be content wit the definition indicated by the annotations. But it is neither u reasonable nor uncharitable to suppose that there are still clerg men who would claim this phrase as authority for obliging the people to observe a strict fast before Communion. Would the Com mission regard such a claim as lawful? If not, should there not be i the canon a clear affirmation that the teaching of this obligation h *no* authority in the Church of England? There is material for a affirmation of this sort in the Reports of both Convocations, fro the Upper House of Canterbury in 1893,[2] and from York in 189 The Prayer Book proposed in 1928 contained a rubric safeguardi liberty of conscience, but it was heavily biased with this preambl that "It is an ancient and laudable custom of the Church to recei this Holy Sacrament fasting." In the same year Dr Percy Dearm produced a vigorous denial that "fasting reception," in its mode Anglican rigidity, was at all "ancient;"[3] and as long ago as 19 Bishop Mandell Creighton showed that it is no "custom" in a sen

[1] *Concerning the Service of the Church.*

[2] *E.g.*, Report No. 274, par. 8: "That, regard being had to the practice i the Apostolic Church in this matter, to teach that it is a sin to communica otherwise than fasting, is contrary to the teaching and spirit of the Church England." *Chronicle of Convocation*, May 5th, 1893. What degree of respon bility attaches to a priest who commends the use of manuals—*e.g.*, *Sa Swithun's Prayer Book*—which number this among sins suggested for conf sion: "I have broken my fast before Communion"?

The Truth about Fasting, with special reference to Fasting Commun (1928).

which gives it the force of law in our Church.[1] So far as I know, neither contention has been refuted. How "laudable" is this discipline we have a duty to judge by its fruits. The Church catechism declares clearly enough "what is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper": Canon XXIV incorporates one element from the preparation prescribed there (though *penitence* is a less comprehensive, and therefore less appropriate, word than the *repentance* of the Catechism) and leaves this ambiguous phrase for the rest. When consciences are being laden with unlawful burdens, when in many parishes, for the sake of this discipline, the Communion is turned again into a Mass, or the English Sunday morning is made already a pitiable wreck, the affliction of the Church is too acute to admit of ambiguity.

Canon XXVIII permits the use of the Bidding Prayer "before *any* sermon, Lecture, or Homily": ought not the Sermon at the Holy Communion to be excepted from this permission? the provision of the Prayer for the Church Militant immediately after the Sermon makes the revival of the Bidding from Prone redundant. But one meets it now from time to time in "correct" churches. The Bidding is intended for University Sermons and others not incorporated in the Liturgy or Common Prayers.

Canon XXXI (*Of Sponsors or Godfathers and Godmothers*) represents an attempt to tighten baptismal discipline, and any serious measure designed to restore this Sacrament to its proper dignity deserves most careful attention. The proposal is that

> r every child that is to be baptized there shall be at least one godparent of the same sex, who shall have been confirmed and who shall not be the child's parent.
>
> In addition to such godparent, it is desirable that there should be one other godparent of the same sex and one other godparent of the opposite sex.

The provisions are compiled from the Prayer Book rubric, Canon XIX of 1603 and its amendment of 1865. The old canon forbade parents to be godparents for their own children, and (in the Latin version) required that all godparents should have received Holy Communion. The restriction was found in time to be too narrow, and the clergy were obliged either to ignore it or to refuse baptism. Thus in 1824-5, Bishop Blomfield at Chester gave his judgment, upon inquiry made, that "the clergy could not refuse non-communicant or illiterate sponsors."[2] Samuel Wilberforce, when curate of Checkenden in 1830, wrote to his brother: "I cannot make up my mind as to enforcing the having communicated on godfathers. The only infant I have yet refused still waits, because they can get no such sponsors. What is your advice?"[3] In 1855 the Canterbury Convocation appointed a Joint Committee to consider the canon, and the motion for its repeal, presented in 1860, produced an important debate in the Upper House on the nature and validity of the whole canon law. Bishop Pelham said that in his diocese of Norwich he had asked in forty-three ruridecanal meetings, "What

[1] *The Church and the Nation*. Charges and Addresses. Edited by Louise Creighton (1901), pp. 308-9.

[2] *Memoir*, i, p. 109.

[3] *Life*, i, p. 46 *f*.

are the chief impediments in the way of parents bringing the children to baptism, and obtaining fit persons as sponsors for them? and the unhesitating reply had been "The Twenty-Ninth Canon." Finally, in 1865, the clause excluding parents was removed, bu otherwise the canon was left as in 1603: it is treated now at best a an ideal, nowhere as a law. *Prima facie*, then, the intention of th new canon is liberative—to release the clergy from too strict a law But in fact it is restrictive, for if it is promulgated it will oblige th clergy to refuse many children whom they would now accept—afte making the best use, perhaps, of what opportunity was given ther No working parish priest could hope, in the present situation in ou towns at least, to find always one confirmed godparent *of the same sex as*, and not the parent of, the child. The Commission may con sider that the font ought thus to be fenced for the Church's good and there would be found many to agree with them. But this re striction raises theological questions of the first importance. Hither the Church of England has regarded Baptism as so "generally neces sary to salvation" that she has provided for its private administra tion, without godparents, for infants in danger of death, and h risked her credit with Puritans and Parliament to enjoin even l administration when no priest can be had. It would be entirely ne for her to enact a discipline which she knows would exclude lar numbers of infants from Baptism; which would, in fact, condem many in the new generation to go through life to death unbaptize for every parish priest knows the difficulty of persuading adults repair the omission of their infancy. No change so subversive oug to be made in the law before the Church has satisfied herself of th theology underlying it. It may be pointed out, furthermore, that th discipline of 1603, stricter as it appears to be, was framed on th assumption that every adult would be confirmed and would ha communicated: to find communicant godparents was not difficu and reference to the title of Canon XXIX, *Children not Commu cants, pueri cœnæ domini incapaces*, and to its immediate source Parker's Advertisements, "Item, that no childe be admitted answere as godfather or godmother, except the childe hath receav the communion,"[2] makes it clear that the intention of the old can was not so much to secure communicant as against non-commu cant godparents, as to exclude from being sponsors irresponsi children, not come to years of discretion. The proposed canon wou be more workable without the insistence that the confirmed spon be of the same sex as the child—a needless limitation, one wou have thought. If we are still to believe ourselves to be a natio church and not a sect, a more practical measure would be a mo tion to parochial clergymen to meet and instruct parents and g parents in the home, on every normal occasion, before the baptis it would be great unwisdom to alienate this opportunity wh nature opens wide the door to grace.

[1] *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1859-60, pp. 118 *ff*. *Life of Wilberforce* pp. 437 *ff*.
[2] Wilkins, iv, p. 249.

Canon XXXIV is entitled *Of Catechizing*, and it incorporates the obligations formerly attaching to that exercise. But the title is misleading: the canon, in fact, obliges parents to submit their children to whatever form of instruction the vicar or his Sunday School superintendent (if she be "godly and competent") may devise. On this, parents may have an opinion of their own.

Canon XXXVI, *Of Holy Matrimony*, proposes to revive in our discipline the ancient canonical distinction between divorce, the dissolution of a marriage made, and a decree of nullity, a declaration that the marriage never has been made. The grounds on which the canon law would declare null a marriage which the secular law has declared dissolved, are too complicated for discussion here; suffice it that there are such grounds, and that it will be most important to secure, not only that the bishop and his Chancellor, sitting in the Court proposed, understand them, but also that the Church at large has confidence that they understand them and will charitably accept their judgment. There must be assurance, too, of uniformity of practice between the dioceses. The proposal is courageous and realistic, but it ought not to stand alone. The Church of England has an external as well as an internal duty: therefore, in undertaking reform in this most urgent matter, she should consider not only the comfort of her own communicants but also some remedy touching the nation, as far as she can, as a whole. Not by further separation, or the appearance of it, will the Church of England more faithfully perform her task, but by using to the utmost advantage—while she maintains her own internal standards—whatever is left of the complex of rights and responsibilities called the Establishment. England might still expect more of the Church than this canon.

The intention of Canon LXV, *Of Priests hearing Confessions*, is laudable: it is time that priests and lay people alike understood that ordination does not confer upon a priest authority to hear confessions when, where, and from whom he will. Penitential discipline was committed to the Church: the Church commits it normally to its ministers at her discretion. But the drafting of the canon might perhaps be improved, to make it easier to discover who may and may not hear confessions: Section E is complicated by a reference back to a former canon, which itself is subject to the provisions of yet a third.

The regulations for Diocesan Conferences, in Canon LXXII, 5, and Canon CXXXIII, would agree more with those of the Anglican Communion elsewhere if an appeal to the archbishop of the province were allowed when the diocesan bishop persists in refusing his sanction to a resolution on which the Chambers of the Clergy and of the Laity have agreed.

Canon CV does not secure the right of ministers who deposit their register books in the Diocesan Record Office to consult them when they require to do so; and it provides no sanction against Diocesan Registrars who neglect the proper care of ancient documents in their custody, or restrict reasonable access to them.

I approach the canons on *The Ecclesiastical Courts* with extreme diffidence, well aware of my incompetence to pronounce on a problem which has baffled the keenest minds, and tested the most stubborn wills, for a century and more. The *Report* summarizes the "three cardinal proposals" thus, at page 95:

1. That the jurisdiction of the Privy Council be abolished, and a Court of Appeal established instead, constituted as suggested at the end of Canon CXII. (*recte*, in Canon CXII).
2. That bishops be encouraged to sit personally in their courts as co-judges with their chancellors.
3. That a court for the trial of bishops be established in each province.

The Final Court of Appeal is to consist of the Archbishop of the Province and four other members,

of whom two shall be members of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province, chosen in turn according to seniority in point of membership of that House from a panel of eight appointed by that House at the beginning of each Convocation; and two shall be communicant members of the Church of England who hold, or have held, high judicial office, nominated from time to time by the Lord Chancellor.

The second and third of the cardinal proposals are admirable enough. The question which will be raised on the first is how will it stand with the Royal Supremacy, as acknowledged in Canon IX. Will it exercise the final appellate jurisdiction of the Crown in ecclesiastical causes? Will it be commissioned by the Crown, or by whom?[1] The *Report* says further:

The principle underlying these proposals is that the courts shall be of an indisputably spiritual source and character.

The meaning of these words is difficult to lay hold of. The word *source* must have reference, not so much to the law administered in the courts—the spiritual source of that is axiomatic to the whole discussion—as to the constituting authority. Who is the held to be? Who or what is understood to be excluded by the words *indisputably spiritual*? The warriors of the last century would have answered, The Crown. It is much to be hoped that the Church, after all this time, is not going to agree with them. For the Church of England so far agrees with Scripture as to accept the King as a spiritual person, to whom at the Reformation the Pope's appellate jurisdiction was transferred (25 Henry VIII, cap. 19). As the Pope had often delegated his jurisdiction to the Archbishop of Canterbury or to some other legate, so the King delegated his, either to the Court of Delegates, or to the High Commission, in which the archbishop or bishops commonly had a place. The Church may right express dissatisfaction with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (which replaced the Court of Delegates in the exercise of this jurisdiction in 1833) on the ground of its theological ar

[1] *The Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 190* gives a useful summary of the constitutional requirements of a Final Court, pages 65 *f.*, par. 358.

unonical incompetence, not on the ground of its defective authority. ut whatever Court of Appeal is proposed in its stead must be nderstood to sit by delegation from the King in Chancery. This is ot explicit in the canon, although the Lord Chancellor is to ominate the two lay members; but is it assumed? A first reading of ection 7 of the canon would give the impression that this Final ourt, described in Section 5, is included in those from which an ggrieved subject may appeal to the High Court of Justice: if this is , then the Final Court is not the King's by delegation, for from that ere could be no appeal. But since Section 7 speaks of *proceedings an Ecclesiastical Court*, and in Section 1 the Final Court is menoned *in addition* to the *three orders* of *the Courts of the Church of gland*, it may be argued that the Final Court is not one of the clesiastical Courts from which there may be an appeal; if this is , Section 7 should stand before Sections 5 and 6, and the doubt ould be less likely to arise. The matter is of the first importance: nless the final jurisdiction, *within* the system, is the King's, the stablished Church is reduced to a corporation bound together by oluntary consensual compact, the articles of which a judge of the ivil Court may be invoked to enforce. It is not too much to say at either this canon is designed by the Commission as a deliberate hallenge to the Establishment—in which case the *Report* ought to ell us plainly, that we may know—or it is so badly drafted, or imerfectly revised, that no man can tell what it intends. A canon hich will be scrutinized everywhere with anxiety, even with susicion, ought at all points to be clear.

I have touched on but a dozen out of the one hundred and thirtyour canons proposed, indicating the sort of questions which ought o be raised, and answered, at many points in the Code. The work s a whole demands much praise and the compliment of close and mmediate consideration. But a searching scrutiny is required, both nto canons and into procedure, before promulgation is attempted. or some of the canons the time is not ripe: while the theology of hristian Initiation, for instance, is undergoing, as it is, such a horough overhaul, it would be premature to meddle with the requirement of godparents. Some, on the other hand, are either wellounded or innocuous enough to serve for experimentation, and ight well be used for testing the procedure, about which, as I have ndicated, there is cause for anxiety enough.

The history of the canon law is not the most encouraging of udies; too often one sees the best of men, the most diligent of abours, spent in all good conscience upon a course which has proved n time to have brought ill to the Church. One sees the colossal error f the Middle Ages, perpetrated still in the Roman Church, of enolding in legislation every conceivable activity of life. One sees in he reign of Elizabeth the attempt, not far removed from that, to ecure unity and apparent agreement by enforcing an outward uniormity in matters indifferent—a design as political as it was ecclesistical, and fatal to the authority of the law. One sees the real failure f the legal Reformation itself—the ecclesiastical courts were not

much reformed; pluralities, absence from cures, the abuse of excom munication for temporal or political ends, these provocations con tinued, and greatly embittered a century's controversy already acut upon doctrine and order. Abuses cannot in fact be removed by cano while the conditions producing them are suffered to exist; the death blow to non-residence, and plurality, and *commendam*, was dealt not by the canons or the Convocations, but by the vilified Eccles astical Commission, which forced upon the Church the financial re forms necessary to make obedience attractive. Nor is the history c the Convocations greatly encouraging: between 1534 and 1717, onl two codes of canons formally promulgated; between 1852 and 1947 seven canons formally amended and two new ones added. That i not the sum of the achievements of the Convocations, by a lon way: by means of debate, and Reports, and Resolutions, the life c the Church has been given a measure of direction and cohesion, an the Church Assembly has been created. But year after year th *Chronicle* exhibits the same withered fruit of ecclesiasticism, a con cern for procedure and privileges and party principles out of all pro portion to their place in the life of the Church. Impassioned, high principled, scholarly futility makes diverting bed-time reading fro debates on a Burials Bill or a Lectionary Revision of seventy yea ago: but when it drives vital matters into deadlock in one centur after another—the seventeenth, eighteenth, nineteenth, and twe tieth—one wonders what malady it is that overcomes clergyme when we meet together, and whether Selden spoke not wisdom whe he said of the Westminster Assembly, in 1643,

> There must be some laymen in the synod to overlook the clergy; just as whe the good woman puts a cat into the milk-house to kill a mouse, she sends h maid to look after the cat, lest the cat should eat up the cream.

It is not the most encouraging of studies, the history of the cano law. But for its future, I quote again the speech of Joseph Ha which I have quoted before:

> The Church is a garden or vineyard enclosed: the laws and constitutions it are as a wall or hedge: if these be cast open, in what state are we? Shall t enemies of the Church have such an advantage of us, as to say, we are a la less Church? or shall all men be left loose to their licentious freedom? God heaven forbid.

G. R. Dunstan.

(*Concluded*)

Est autem Fortuna ?

"I returned, and saw under the sun, that the race is not to th swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, n yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of ski but time and chance happeneth to them all." Philosophers a theologians have devoted much attention to the concept of time, b with a few exceptions they have strangely neglected the concept chance. Chance is universal. "Throughout the whole world in eve

lace at all times, Fortune alone is named and invoked by the voices f all; she alone is accused and put in the dock, she is the sole object f our thought, our praise, and our abuse." So wrote Pliny. Chance irrational, and ultimate, according to Cicero. "Surely nothing is so t variance with reason and stability as chance. Hence it seems to me hat it is not in the power even of God himself to know what event s going to happen accidentally and by chance. For if He knows, hen the event is certain to happen; but if it is certain to happen, hance does not exist. And yet fortune does exist (*est autem fortuna*), herefore there is no foreknowledge of things that happen by chance." ergil said the same thing, but more tersely, "Fortuna omnipotens t ineluctabile fatum."

In time of war especially men are aware of chance, fate, fortune, azard, when they live constantly in the presence of sudden death, hen every bullet—and every bomb—has its mark. During the air ids it was strange to remark how one family suffered and another scaped, and one often heard the saying quoted, "One shall be taken nd another left." The newspapers often called attention to the scape of the altar or of the crucifix when a church was destroyed, s though this were providential, though stories of the sudden death f nuns at Compline or of the destruction of the Guards' Chapel uring divine service did not lend themselves to such treatment. erhaps during the war fatalism and faith both grew stronger, but n any case it remains for faith to settle its account with fate and ortune.

The priest in his pastoral office is often confronted with the freaks f chance, with sudden, accidental death, with misfortunes that come n a strange, inexplicable sequence. In the face of such misfortunes aith is sorely tried, and man is tempted as Job was tempted. Yet in he training of the clergy insufficient attention is paid to the intelectual and moral difficulties attendant upon this concept of chance. o reference is made to the subject in the standard textbooks used y ordinands, although chance presents a problem which bears upon ll pastoral work. For chance happeneth to all, and not only to the nultitude who patronize the football pools! Thus an overseas bishop as recently found it necessary to warn his flock against bringing God's name into everyday affairs, simply because of this problem of hance. Writing in his diocesan magazine of a recent disastrous fire, e said: "I must dissent emphatically from the views expressed in ertain quarters that the fire was a 'visitation,' or that some properies were saved at the expense of others by the direct intervention of Providence. Some of those people who sought to bring God's name nto the story said things which are quite shocking."

The concept of chance also challenges the Christian apologist, yet few works of apologetics devote much attention to it. The view that "whirl is king," that history is the "crass casualty" of Hardy's sonnet, is a powerful factor in modern scepticism, and one with which the Christian philosopher must grapple. It calls for a full and searching treatment that must ultimately involve the whole meaning of history and of divine Providence.

Although this concept of chance was so powerful in the ancien world, and is prevalent among all civilized peoples today, it i apparently unknown to primitive peoples. It is certainly not biblical For the Hebrews every event was according to the will of God. Go was supreme in nature and in history, the source of all things, t whom were to be ascribed all particular events as well as all genera causes. The Hebrew language has no word for "chance." Of the tw words which may be so translated, we are told that *miqreh*, whic occurs seven times in Ecclesiastes and four times elsewhere in th Old Testament, means "not something independent of Jahweh, bu something unexpected by man" (*H.D.B.*). The other word, *pena* occurs only twice, and means an external event unwilled by man. I the New Testament the concept appears only in St Luke x, 3 ("By chance there came down a certain priest that way"), and i 1 Cor. xv, 37 ("It may chance of wheat or of some other grain" In our Lord's teaching chance is not recognized as a factor in lif Rather, "the very hairs of your head are all numbered," and "ther is a special providence in the fall of a sparrow." In the Prayer Boo the word luck or its derivatives occurs in the version of the psalm two or three times, where it simply means "prosperity," as in Tyr dale's translation of Genesis xxxix, 2, "And the Lorde was wit Joseph, and he was a luckie felowe."

For the Christian, of course, our Lord's teaching is ultimate, bu Christ's view of Providence must be distinguished from that fatalis to which it may be easily reduced, the fatalism we find in late Judaism and in Mohammedanism. "A man does not hurt his finge in this world unless it has been decreed above," says the *Mishna* and again, "The plague may rage for seven years, and yet no ma will die before the appointed hour." The Mohammedan view ma perhaps be represented by Kipling's poem "The Answer," of on who asked why a rose fell.

> "Sister, before We smote the Dark in twain,
> Ere yet the Stars saw one another plain,
> Time, Tide, and Space, We bound unto the task
> That thou should'st fall, and such an one should ask."

This view that whatever happens is directly willed by God is nc consonant with our Lord's teaching generally, nor with the petitio in the Lord's Prayer, "Thy will be done." Yet it appears in the Buria Service in the Prayer Book, and many God-fearing men have bee puzzled by the words, "We give thee hearty thanks, for that it hat pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of th sinful world." Can it be that God is *pleased*, they ask, when fc instance a child is strangled by its demented mother, or when it di of some terrible disease, or is still-born? Can it be that whatever i is right?

Nevertheless, in the words of St Augustine, "everything must l referred to divine providence." The same thinker gives us a usefu definition of chance, when he says: "What we call the fortuitous nothing but that, the reason and cause of which is concealed fro

our view." Any treatment of the problem of chance must involve the well-worn question of freedom and determinacy, of which it may be thought that nothing new can be said and of which all discussion hitherto seems inconclusive. From the standpoint of self-determination it may be argued that chance is an inevitable consequence of freedom, since every human act involves factors outside human control. Human prudence attempts to control as many of these factors as possible, but

> "Human Prudence, handmaid of divine Providence,
> Hath inscrutable reckoning with Fate and Fortune."

Human prudence will attempt to control as many factors as possible, and such control is only possible because of determinism in the physical world. Self-determinism, however, is not total determinism. I decide to visit a friend, and as a result am in a certain place at a certain time, not quite as I intended, because my train was delayed by the unforeseen illness of the driver. It *happens* (to borrow an illustration from Bergson) that a strong wind dislodges a tile from a roof top and it falls to the ground, in accordance with what used to be called the law of gravitation. So falling, it strikes my head and there is an *accident*. I did not know that that particular tile was loose, I did not know that the wind was of just sufficient strength to dislodge it, so I did not take the precautions I should have done otherwise—hence the accident. It was my *hap* to be standing where I interrupted the fall of the tile, it was my *hazard* to be there at an inopportune moment, it was my *fate* to be felled by the impact of the tile, though had I not resisted the temptation to call at a bookshop down the road five minutes before it would have been my good *fortune* to escape the injury. But my *luck* was out, for I chanced to be standing in the very place where an accident could not be avoided. So I was a *casualty*. It is quite clear, however, that had I been omniscient I should have removed myself elsewhere. For me chance is a fact, but for God chance does not exist. God allows me to be subject to chance because He has allowed me a limited freedom of self-determination. He foresees all the factors of what we call chance. In general He does not interfere with these factors; in particular cases He may. We thus distinguish His general Providence in the ordering of the world in accordance with His divine purpose from His particular providential acts in forwarding the same purpose.

Chance exists for us men only; it is not ultimate and is subject to God's will. This fact, however, does not lessen the suffering that chance or accident may involve for us ignorant men. So we who are wearied by the changes and chances of this mortal life rest upon God's eternal changelessness. God knows all and He cares for all. Of that the Cross is the supreme testimony and assurance. He, and He alone, can turn whatsoever may befall us to glorious gain.

L. A. Poore.

Why You Should Read It—VIII

William Wilberforce's "Practical View of Christianity"

The name of William Wilberforce[1] is familiar to most people owing to the part which he played in the abolition of the slave trade and also as a prominent member of that band of Evangelical laymen, known as the Clapham Sect, whose integrity did so much to raise the standard of commercial and political life in England, and whose purses were ever open to the claims of deserving charities. Other aspects of his career seem to have been forgotten. He was a shrewd statesman, the friend of Pitt, and, but for his persistent ill-health and his devotion to the cause of the slaves, might have been Prime Minister. Then, too, he possessed a charm of manner which aroused the surprise and admiration of Madame de Staël, who remarked after meeting him: "I had always heard that he was the most religious, but I now find that he is the wittiest man, in England." There is also another aspect of Wilberforce which seems to have escaped notice, his humanism. In spite of a neglected education in early life and a time of idleness in Cambridge, he had a keen love for the classics and often filled up spare moments by learning Horace by heart.[2] Such was the man who produced one of the most popular religious volumes of his day, a volume which ought not to be allowed to fall into complete neglect, for it has a perennial appeal which makes it almost worthy to stand beside William Law's *Serious Call*, to which, indeed, it has many resemblances.

Wilberforce was moved to write his treatise by the distress aroused in him by the neglect of God and His providence which he found prevailing among the higher orders and the lukewarm state of even professing Christians. He was especially concerned for the young, many of whom lost their faith through sheer ignorance of its contents and lack of instruction.

He began the actual composition on August 3rd, 1793: "I laid the first timbers of my tract," he notes in his diary. Later in the year he discussed his project with the Rev. Richard Cecil, who urged him to continue with it. But other friends were not so encouraging, and Isaac Milner, Dean of Carlisle and President of Queens' College, Cambridge, tried to make him abandon it. None the less he went on his way in spite of scanty leisure and many interruptions. A visit to Buxton in 1796 for treatment allowed more time, but even there he was so well known a figure that quiet was difficult to obtain. Then in November, 1796, he accepted an invitation from the Bishop of Lincoln to spend a week at his palace at Buckden. This enabled him to complete his work, save for some necessary revision, and on February 10th, 1797, all was ready for the printer. Proofs were corrected

[1] The official life by his sons, R. I. and Samuel, appeared soon after his death. An excellent modern study is Professor Coupland's *Wilberforce: A Narrative*.

[2] It is not without significance that on the title-page of the *Practical View* there is printed a double motto—John v, 39, and a quotation from Milton's *Comus*.

in committees when business flagged, and at last on April 12th the volume came out. Wilberforce had been much perplexed as to whether to allow his name to appear on the title page, and, in the manner of his day, had drawn up a long list of reasons for and against. But his publisher made this a condition of accepting the volume. This latter was, indeed, very dubious about the success of the venture. There was, he explained, little demand for religious books. In the end an edition of only 500 was printed.

The opinion of the publisher, like that of many of his kind before and since, for publishing is a ticklish business, proved very wide of the mark. Within six months five editions, numbering 7,500 copies, had been sold, a circulation for those days which entitled the book to rank distinctly as a "best-seller." In America there were twenty-five editions within as many years, and translations into French, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, and German soon appeared. There can be but little doubt that the immense popularity of the book was due, in part at least, to the fact that Wilberforce was a public character, and, to a lesser degree, to his being a layman. At that epoch, though there were a few pious ladies—Hannah More is an example—who wrote religious books, such productions were almost entirely confined to members of the clergy.

Among Evangelicals the reception of the *Practical View* was naturally most cordial. The veteran John Newton described it to Mr Grant as "a book which must and will be read by persons in the higher circles, who are quite inaccessible to us little folk, who will neither hear what we can say, nor read what we may write." Others who were of a serious turn of mind, though not of quite the same views, were also appreciative. Edmund Burke, who died on July 9th, 1797, spent some of the last days of his life in reading it and derived much comfort from the exercise. Its effect upon the careless, for whom it had been specially designed, was also considerable. Henry Thornton wrote to Zachary Macaulay: "Many of his gay and political friends admire and approve of it; though some do but dip into it. . . .[1] The Dissenters, many of them, call it legal." An interesting testimony comes from one whose outlook was very different. Arthur Young, the author of *Travels in France*, has left the following account of his reactions. "I read it coldly at first, but advanced with more attention. It brought me to a better sense of my dangerous state; but I was very much involved in hesitation and doubt, and was very far from understanding the doctrinal part of the book. This was well, for it induced me to read it again and again, and it made so much impression upon me that I scarcely knew how to lay it aside."

The book had been written at the right moment, for the outbreak of the French Revolution had sobered men's minds and turned the thoughts of many to the need for religion—if not for themselves, yet at least for the lower orders! Its total impression was immense and a real change of outlook, especially among the upper classes, may be

[1] They probably felt as did Samuel Pepys of William Penn's *Sandy Foundations Shaken*—"it is a serious book and not fit for everybody to read."

dated from its publication. What really drove home its appeal was the witness of the life of the author, a life which was lived in the public eye, and contained nothing that did not commend the doctrines he set forth and the ideals he propounded. To many it must have revealed the secret springs of a character which they could not but admire.

Wilberforce himself referred to his *opus* as a tract; but it was far more considerable in size, running to over 100,000 words, and in this it recalls some of Dr Pusey's weighty contributions to the *Tracts for the Times*. It was addressed to all persons of a serious disposition and called upon them to recognize the difference between being almost and altogether Christians. All sections of the Church were appealed to, and there was no endeavour to promote the views of any particular party or school of thought. It gave Wilberforce, as he himself confessed, an opportunity of saying things to people in high station—not excluding bishops!—which could hardly be said to them even in private. Fine-spun theories and novel ideas are avoided and readers are addressed in plain and straightforward terms. The writer had an intimate knowledge of those whom he approached, and quite deliberately he tried to make what he wrote acceptable to them, though without any "dereliction of principle." The book was not aimed at sceptics or unbelievers[1]—a recognition of the authority of the Scriptures is postulated—and so controversy is avoided. The great precepts of the Gospel are set forth in a positive manner and compared, keenly yet soberly, with the ordinary practice and outlook of professing Christians. Some criticized the style as diffuse, but Wilberforce defended himself by explaining that he had deliberately repeated himself in order to drive home his lessons. In tone the book is earnest, and even affectionate, with many happy illustrations, and exhibits a shrewd insight into the motives which inspire the thoughts and actions of human beings in general.

According to the fashion of an age when "blurbs" were unknown, the title set out the contents more or less in full. It ran: *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians in the Higher and Middle Classes of this Country contrasted with Real Christianity*. The first five chapters follow rather well-worn lines and are intended to arouse in the reader an appreciation of the seriousness of the subject and the need for taking pains. "We expect to be Christians, without labour, study or inquiry." Wilberforce begins, as Butler began his *Analogy*,[2] by pointing out that this life is not all and that our future destiny depends on the manner in which we spend it. Salvation cannot be taken for granted, nor is it an easy matter to attain to. None can be a Christian without im-

[1] Chapter VII, §iii, however, contains "Brief observations addressed to Sceptics and Unitarians."

[2] Wilberforce had been reading Butler in the summer of 1793, when he was thinking out his tract. It is interesting to note that when in 1785 he first began to take an interest in serious things Pitt recommended the *Analogy*, though later he admitted that for himself it had always raised more doubts than it had satisfied.

mense pains. Even if such efforts are made there is still need for the Divine help and for man to surrender himself to the will and purpose of God. The pattern of attainment is the life of Christ. From the individual he goes on, in Chapter VI, to review the life of the community. He finds in contemporary England a grave decline in the observance of religion owing to the growth of prosperity and luxury. In literature the prevailing tone is sceptical. The example of recent events in France ought to warn us of the consequences of all this. He then gives a picture of what a Christian country should be like and sketches a community in which all are trying to discharge their duties and work together in harmony and co-operation for the good of the whole. Religion is the only antidote to that "moral distemper of political communities," self-seeking, whether by the rich or the poor. In the final chapter he earnestly calls upon all Christians to take their part, both by example and precept, in making this ideal a reality. A revival of true religion will do more for the country than any kind of political expedient. They must be generous to others, but self-denying in their own lives. A life of mere idleness is unworthy of a Christian. Though they are to hold resolutely by what they believe, they must show tolerance towards those who differ over non-essentials. In this time of national difficulty the country needs their prayers. A noble and outspoken passage towards the close sums up his appeal and deserves quotation, preserving the italics of the original. "It would be an instance in myself of that very false shame which I have condemned in others, if I were not boldly to avow my firm persuasion, that *to the decline of religion and morality our national difficulties must both directly and indirectly be chiefly ascribed; and that my only solid hopes for the well-being of my country depend not so much on her fleets and armies, not so much on the wisdom of her rulers, or the spirit of her people, as on the persuasion that she still contains many, who, in a degenerate age, love and obey the Gospel of Christ; on the humble trust that the intercession of these may still be prevalent, that for the sake of these, Heaven may still look upon us with an eye of favour.*" He then requests the prayers of the readers "for the success of this feeble endeavour in the service of true religion."

This summary of the contents of the tract, and above all the closing passage, will, I think, without further elaboration on my part convince the reader that what Wilberforce wrote a century and a half ago is well suited to the times in which we are now living and suggests a remedy for the difficulties, both political and ecclesiastical, with which we are faced. Little need be allowed for the many changes which have taken place in the interval for, like our Blessed Lord, the writer concentrates on fundamental principles rather than detailed practice, though this is by no means neglected. But for the fact that Wilberforce deliberately limited his appeal to those classes of the community of which he had first-hand knowledge, his volume might quite well have anticipated a contemporary appeal by bearing the simpler title *Towards the Conversion of England.*

L. E. Elliott-Binns.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. G. R. Dunstan is Sub-Warden of St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden.

The Rev. L. A. Poore is Chaplain of St John's College, York.

Dr Elliott-Binns is the author of *Religion in the Victorian Era*, etc.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GIFT OF MINISTRY. By Daniel T. Jenkins. Faber and Faber. 6s.

Mr Jenkins, having discussed the nature of Reformed Churchmanship in his first book, and (less satisfactorily) its implications for the prayer life in his second, now turns to consider what a Reformed Ministry should be. But he does a great deal more than that, and this third book of his contains some of his most trenchant writing. It should be required reading for students (and lecturers) in "pastoral theology," for lay readers, and for those best friends of the clergy, the critics in the congregation. It will provide these last with plenty of fresh missiles.

In his first two chapters he more or less repeats his charges against Catholicism delivered in *The Nature of Catholicity* and elsewhere. I shall barely discuss this part of the book, as it would require full treatment on its own. I shall only say that he seems often to pose us with false alternatives: "The issue between Catholicism and Protestanism is whether the ministry depends on the Word and sacraments for its authority, or whether the Word and sacraments depend on a ministry which exists prior to them" (p. 50). Of course the Word (that is Christ) comes first; but those who regard ordination itself as a sacramental rite cannot understand what is meant by the accusation that the ministry for them exists "prior" to sacraments. Later Mr Jenkins says that "the other side of the minister's office, his representation of Christ to the people, is not a special status, which confers upon him a different order of spiritual being from his fellows, but a *miracle*" (130). In the sense that every sacrament is a miracle: Yes. In the sense of Malebranchian occasionalism, that the minister consists of a series of isolated blobs of miraculous inspiration by Christ, put together like a photograph transmitted by cable: No. Mr Jenkins warns us, rightly, against a deadening kind of *securitas*; but in the ministry surely we need *certitudo* of Christ's mediated action? I cannot see that Mr Jenkins promises it.

Nevertheless, the book is valuable for others besides Reformed Protestants. At this time, when the "branch" and the "bridge" theories of the Church have gone out of fashion to be replaced by the "hors d'œuvre" theory, it is good to have Mr Jenkins' sturdy statement of Reformed principles as a whole—he is emphatically not content that they should be patronizingly judged as "an emphasis of greater or less usefulness from a superior vantage." Indeed he claims—and that is why he has written the book—that "Pro

testantism, once it recovers its authentic criteria of theological judgement, provides a more helpful setting for the recovery of a right understanding of the doctrine of the ministry in terms of contemporary experience than Catholicism does." It is this "in terms of contemporary experience" that gives the specific value to the book. So many studies of the Ministry, "the priest as student," "the prayer life of the priest," and so forth, are disconnected pieces of exhortation or prescription obviously unaware of the social pressures, the historical patterns within which the Church has to move, and the clergy with her. I do not suggest that they are wholly useless; nor that Mr Jenkins supplies something which now renders them finally redundant. But I do think that he has thought out, and expressed, the kind of intellectual, spiritual, and psychological situation upon which the techniques of prayer and priestcraft will have to work, and to modify themselves in working. It does not seem clear to me that it is necessarily through the exercise of "Reformed" discipline that Mr Jenkins has arrived at the analyses he gives us; indeed, the thinkers and writers he most often leans upon suggest the opposite —not only is the influence of Dr Demant clearly traceable throughout, but we get a curious "existential" pedigree which includes the heterogeneous names of Donne, Kierkegaard, Gerard Manley Hopkins, T. S. Eliot, and Karl Barth. (Donne as an "existential" thinker is a new idea; there is this to be said for it, that Heidegger, too, was originally a scholastic.) Moreover, Mr Jenkins does not speak of the work of, for instance, the French priests in the *France Pays de Mission*. (It is a sobering reflection that whether a man today in this country turns "Catholic" or "Protestant" may depend to some extent upon the accidental circumstance that he learned French rather than German, or vice versa, at school!) Here is evidence that the unsupple "Catholic" framework of ministry and discipline can be bent according to the exigencies of the Holy Ghost.

But here in this country we have scarcely begun thinking of the meaning of the priestly vocation for our times. And Mr Jenkins, whatever his sources, can help us. Especially there is his emphasis that " the minister has (on the manward side) to be considered the most typical of men." Not typical of man "on his spiritual side" as the theology of Liberalism implied, but representative of man as he stands before God. This means that he must wrestle with the meaning of faith, and more than any undergo the discipline of doubt. "He must have all the poet's sensitivity to the unimaginable weight of the unintelligible world without the poet's saving irresponsibility. . . ." ("Irresponsibility" is a hard word to use of the poet, but it is clear what he means.) So with his preaching: "It is only on the most childish and undiscriminating level that we can speak of the pulpit as a coward's castle. It is more like a flying trapeze, with no net below." This leads Mr Jenkins to a brilliant discussion of the place and function of the modern university in relation to the Church and the Ministry. As the Minister is the persona of the people, so his education should be "normative for all education." Those who read the author's pamphlet on the place of a Theo-

logical faculty in a modern university (contributed to the "University Pamphlets" series) will find his theme worked out in more detail here, and with more reference to other disciplines. He is able, incidentally, to dispose again of the accusation that Barthianism is anti-intellectual, and that its denial of the "point of contact" between God and man, other than that created in man by faith, means a Manichean dismissal of reason, culture, and the rest. At the same time he trenchantly warns us against the kind of "doom" preaching which does not arise out of the Gospel: "We must beware of accepting uncritically a Spenglerian pseudo-historical romanticism and linking it up illegitimately with the theology of *krisis*. The notion of cycles of civilization is not specifically Christian. . . ." As he is largely considering the West, I suppose it was legitimate to leave the Orthodox Church out of account in his comparison of confessions (though he might have noted Orthodoxy as an exception to his accusation that Catholicism makes nothing of the diaconate). His remarks about the Establishment are sane and refreshing; so is his criticism of John Milton. Altogether, if he does not convert us to Protestantism, he strengthens us in our conviction that Catholicism is the only sort of religion that it is worth having a Reformation about.

M. Jarrett-Kerr, C.R.

St Teilo's Priory, Cardiff.

Reformation Old and New. A Tribute to Karl Barth. Edited by F. W. Camfield. Lutterworth Press. 18s.

Barth's sixtieth birthday is marked by this worthy tribute, one of sympathy and collaboration, not of panegyric. Plan and execution are alike admirable. The editor treats of the Barthian theology at length, and is followed by seven well-known writers who write on a variety of subjects. Before such learning and competence the reviewer can only prostrate himself. He would be altogether confounded, but for Volume III, I, of the *Kirchliche Dogmatik*. It appeared too late to be used by Dr Camfield or his collaborators, but in time to resuscitate the reviewer's impudence, and to give him some ammunition to fire off at them.

Dr Camfield begins with a brilliant chapter on Barth's development from one-sided paradoxical prophet to the more systematic and professorial manner of his later works. After that he devotes seventy pages to a summary of the four huge volumes of the *Dogmatik*, only one of which has as yet been translated. Dr Camfield has managed to combine extreme faithfulness to his subject with some of the sweep and nervousness of original writing, and thus succeeds in giving us what is by far the best statement in English of Barth's doctrines. He gives a very clear and adequate description of Barth's doctrine of God, and of how God is known. Next comes Predestination, which is not through any secret decree, but in Christ the revealed Word of God. Then we come to the Command of God

as it meets us in the Gospel. It is concrete and particular, clear and personal, demanding immediate obedience, and not, as is commonly held, a set of general principles which we are left to work out in detail.

We now find ourselves placed in the hands of J. McConnachie, who takes us on an interesting tour over ground some of which we have already traversed in the editor's company. J. Lovell Cocks discourses eloquently of saving Faith: the voice is that of the Wesleyan heart-religion, in spite of the Barthian hairiness of face and neck. D. T. Jenkins writes of the need to rediscover the congregation. It is a pity he did not draw upon the experience of the Confessional Church. There is something very significant in the way in which, during the Kirchenkampf, the congregation began of their own accord to repeat the Creed, formerly read at the altar by the pastor alone. That again prompts the reflection that the Anglican recitation of the Creeds by people as well as priest expresses formally something that ought to have a material counterpart in the Church's life. W. A. Whitehouse, in his essay on "The State and Divine Law," appeals to the latest New Testament exegesis, and suggests that the State is not to be regarded as exclusively the domain of law and wrath, but that it also belongs to the realm of grace and redemption. T. F. Torrance deals with the anthropology of Calvin and Barth—if we dare call it by that name—or perhaps we should rather say their doctrine of the *imago Dei*. On this Barth's exposition of Genesis i, 26-27 in his volume on Creation throws further light. There is an I-THOU within the Godhead ("Let us make") to which corresponds the I-THOU within mankind (male and female). Christ, the Image of God, is not to be thought of without His bride the Church.

Now we come to the two essays which, along with Dr Camfield's, pleased and instructed us the most. First is H. A. Hodges, who finds the "Crisis of Philosophy" in that modern relativism which denies our very power to know, and which, because it is a symptom of despair, cannot be dissipated by the invitation to be sceptical about its own scepticism. Thomism ignores the Renaissance, and is a "denial of the Christian doctrine of history" and an "attempt to freeze Philosophy at the stage in its development which was most congenial to Christian interests," and so it is unable to deal adequately with modern relativism. Professor Hodges leaves us empty-handed standing at a door opening on the dark and doubtful future, directing us to go on through it and see what we can pick up. But he encourages us by the reminder that Theology, being founded on God's own words and acts, is not dependent upon philosophy. Faith can find a philosophy, as the hermit-crab can find a shell, but the process cannot be reversed; a philosophy cannot produce faith, or a shell a crab.

G. Hendry, in "The Rediscovery of the Bible," shows us the value of the statement that the Bible is not the Word of God itself (which God alone can speak) but the witness of prophets and apostles who have heard that Word and expect to hear it again. When God creates faith in us, the Bible becomes His Word. There is only one

hole we can pick in this illuminating essay. Prophets and apostles are only a part of the Bible. "Seek not to be saved by synecdoche," said Bishop Andrewes long ago, warning us against the faith that is without obedience. We today are too inclined to take seriously only the historical parts of the Bible, or the most loftily "religious" parts —or if we have fundamentalist leanings, to claim that it is all historical fact. As Barth has said, both tendencies are the children of the same weak spirit. The Bible contains legend and saga, proverb and love-song, and many other genres, some of them neither historical nor prophetic, some unblushingly "secular." But whatever the form, it is still the Word of God, or the witness to it. We must not commit synecdoche with revelation either, by taking a part for the whole.

C. W. Quin.

Killinagh, Co. Cavan.

God's Will for Church and Nation. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.
The Renewal of Democracy. By E. Brewin and R. Johnson. S.C.M. Press. 3s. 6d.

Here are two books concerned with Christian citizenship. It is obviously the theme of the second book; but this is also as a matter of fact the fundamental concern running through all the Reports of the Commission of the Church of Scotland for the interpretation of God's will in the present crisis. And it is right that the call to theology in civic action should come from the Church of Scotland, as of all the national Churches it has ever seemed to the present reviewer to be the most national—and this not in any disparaging sense.

These reports received a deservedly warm welcome on all sides and in many Church papers when they were first published piecemeal; they merit collection into more permanent form in one volume such as is now given them. For, as might be expected from a Commission whose convener was Professor John Baillie, they combine with a practical and realist approach to everyday problems a depth of theological insight and an incisive style which make them much more exciting to read than is usually the case with a collective report, and render them of abiding value. Nor are they merely diagnoses of the sickness of our times, but each year's instalment culminates in a recommended plan of action—whether it be in the field of industry, or that of education, in the home or in the parish.

The relation between the Church and civilized society is discussed, and the conclusion reached that the Church cannot evade responsibility for civilization. The Church is seen as having to pursue in these islands a missionary rather than a strictly pastoral strategy. Principles of industrial reconstruction are framed and stated, from which it is concluded that the Gospel commits believers to a measure of socialization, though under the non-committal name, Communal control. The crisis for our society is seen in the modern family, its

declining size and the instability of the marriage bond. But here we come to the individual problem, and one that can admit of no general solution. The Commission can but emphasize the need for the teaching and pastoral work of the Church.

A short review, however, must needs do scant justice to a volume which, though part was written for the General Assembly of 1942, still remains fresh and up to date; indeed, the passage of the years has merely intensified the urgency of the call.

As the first book reviewed here starts from the Christian standpoint and works towards the program to which that commits one in the modern world, so the second book under review, a slighter work altogether, seems to start from the standpoint of the democrat, and sets out to show that this has something to do with Christianity. In the main it is a careful, conscientious, but dull statement of the methods and working of our system, national and local. The book is aimed primarily at university students, but it is not clear for what level of education and intelligence the book is written. Those who want simple straightforward information, such as is given about local government, will be able to make little of such a sentence as this: "Natural law concepts are very liable to ideological taint, and even though this may be avoided in a statement of moral principles it all too easily creeps in when one states principles of political morality. . . ." Though I found the style frigid and at times unnecessarily involved, yet this is a thoroughly competent piece of work. There is a close-knit argument running through the whole, well documented at every stage. It is an intellectual discipline to accompany the writers through their vindication of a society planned by a Western democracy. It is definitely a discipline, and as definitely an edifying one.

Ronald Lunt.

Liverpool College.

The Authority of the Biblical Revelation. By H. Cunliffe-Jones. James Clarke and Co. 7s. 6d.

The Old Testament in the New Testament. By R. V. G. Tasker. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

Professor Cunliffe-Jones disclaims any intention to do more than map out the problem presented by the Bible in the modern Church. The solution, on his view (and surely he is right), does not yet exist, anyhow not for Protestants. The Roman Catholic Church, for all practical purposes, upholds the traditional inerrancy of Scripture and denies that any conflict can exist between the interpretations of the Church Fathers and sound learning. For those that are able to receive it, such dogmatism makes possible a simple reception of Scripture as the Word of God, and Catholics can continue to nourish their souls on this food until Protestants, through many agonies and much desolation of spirit, have achieved a new positive interpretation, from which Catholicism can then borrow in all tran-

quillity: no doubt Providence has allowed the Protestant schism for this end.

Mr Cunliffe-Jones maps out the various elements which have to find their place in a new synthesis—the Fathers are neither to be rejected nor swallowed whole, living tradition has its rights, but is to be judged by the Scripture it illumines, natural theology is neither to be denied nor made an independent criterion of Scripture. The more one admires his balanced many-sidedness, the more one despairs of living to see the first streaks of dawn, for who is sufficient for these things? And, even if the sufficient theologians could be found, can anything so delicately many-sided as their theology would have to be ever affect the common Christian mind? Our problem would be short-cut and simplified, he says, if a crisis in our relations with the secular world drove us to rally round any existing standard of interpretation which we have—for example, the Thirty-Nine Articles. But this would involve a fundamentalist reaction, and no one can pray for that. Meanwhile, we fatuously proclaim that the Bible is far more powerful through the illumination shed by the historical method: and nobody reads it, and nobody preaches it, because nobody knows how to see the Word of God in what is interpreted as the religious experience of men. Mr Cunliffe-Jones is under no illusions about the existing situation, or about the commonly proposed remedies.

One can but wait for a new positive understanding to grow, and he is able to indicate certain actual growing-points. There is, for example, the discovery of the interpretation of the Old Testament to be found in the New. This, being a matter of sheer history and fact, is near enough to the mind of our generation for us to be able to handle it with tolerable skill: and it initiates us into a way of thinking which goes beyond mere fact and history towards the recovery of the theological wholeness of Scripture. Professor Tasker's book is an admirably discreet and lucid exposition for the general reader of the results obtained in this field. He avoids tempting speculations about what New Testament writers *may* have had in their heads as they wrote, but he has some new and interesting things to say, especially about the Lucan writings. Since his book is a survey of the whole New Testament field, it is made up of expository detail and hardly lends itself to general review. The thing to do is not to discuss it but to read it.

Austin Farrer.

Oxford.

The Groundwork of the Gospels, with some collected papers. By R. O. P. Taylor. Blackwell. 7s. 6d.

The greater part of this collection of Provost Taylor's literary remains is devoted to his theory about the pre-literary state of the Synoptic material. The author is concerned to defend the historicity of this material against two suggestions, which he regards as leading

to scepticism. Many people, he thinks, infer from the gap of thirty-five years between the Crucifixion and the writing of Mark that our information about Jesus rests "upon late and dubious reports." And the commonly held view that Jesus spoke in Aramaic increases the distance between him and our Greek Gospels.

In setting out to reduce these grounds for scepticism, he takes first the "popular fancy" that Mark's material consisted of "charming legends formed . . . into a rosy mist which floated over the minds of unsophisticated peasants" (p. 55); rather, he holds, it was made up of units of tradition deliberately formed into "Chreiai" by the apostles, then memorized and constantly repeated by a class of ὑπηρέται, of whom John Mark was one (Acts xiii, 5, in attendance upon Saul and Barnabas); finally, as Peter's ἑρμηνευτής, Mark polished up Peter's tradition for publication when he committed it to writing.

One would like to say that the Provost had thrown light upon this most obscure period of Christian history, but it is difficult to feel impressed by his arguments. (Let us hope that the choice between his view and scepticism is not completely exclusive!) Much of the case is built upon assumptions which are by no means self-evident, and proceeds by inferences which are scarcely cogent—*e.g.*, Mark is Petrine; Peter was an apostolic witness (Acts ii, 32, etc.); therefore he would have been "well aware of the primary importance of evidence . . . and would have given great care to the integrity and form of his evidence" (p. 13); which is taken for proof that Peter stereotyped the very wording of the tradition. Again, much is made to depend on pressing exact senses on such words as ὑπηρέτης in Acts, or ἑρμηνευτής, χρέια as used by Papias (*ap.* Eusebius). Or again, a story of Clement of Alexandria (Eus. *H.E.* ii, 15: Peter, hearing that Mark had written his Gospel, authorized the book to be read in the churches) is the basis of an inference that even before the first written Gospel the Church's liturgy contained precise "Gospels" in our sense. Chapter X contains some interesting information about the Chreia-form, drawn from the Rhetores Græci, but greatly oversimplifies in equating all the sections of the Gospel material with this form. (Incidentally, on p. 75 the complaint is made that Form-criticism has ignored the Chreia, but compare Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, Chapter VI.) There are thus many weak links here, and much unconvincing generalization. Next Chapters XI and XII put forward the thesis that Christ taught in Greek, but take no account, for instance, of Torrey, and are too slight to be of much use.

The argument of the longest appended paper, called The Paracletes, is that Barnabas' title, "Son of Paraclesis" (Acts iv, 36), is equivalent to "the paraclete"—that is, legal advocate. Much is built on this, but is the Hebraism ever used in the singular to mean a definite occupation? ("Sons of the Pharisees," yes; "son of peace," yes; but "son of advocacy"?) It would also be strange, if such an office existed in the Church from the earliest times, that no one is actually called a Christian paraclete until A.D. 177, and then only in joke (p. 120).

The book is pleasantly set out, but there are too many misprints and mistakes like the attribution of Spoonerisms to *Archdeacon* Spooner.

J. D. M. Stuart.

Oxford.

SHORTER NOTICES

St Augustine's "The City of God." Edited by R. V. G. Tasker. Two vols. Dent. 3s.

If they correctly read the signs of the times who tell us that the nemesis of our contemporary civilization is fast approaching, how timely is this publication of a cheap edition of St Augustine's *City of God*. The editor, Professor Tasker, has chosen John Healey's translation, whose English—whilst at times a little tedious—has that grandeur which is found in the best Elizabethan prose; moreover, Professor Tasker has revised some of Healey's more flamboyant passages, retranslated in places where Healey allowed himself undue freedom from the original text, and to the contemporary reader Professor Tasker has done a great service by giving to Healey's work modern spelling and—more important—modern punctuation.

Healey's translation was originally published in 1610 "with the learned comments of Io. Lod. Vives," and to the present edition there is added a short selection from Vives' commentaries. In spite of Henry VIII's extravagant tribute to Vives that by his work "St Augustine, who long time imperfect and obscure, is now at last brought from darkness to light," Professor Tasker frankly admits that rarely does Vives throw much light on St Augustine. But the labour of producing this selection from Vives has not gone unrewarded, for it suffices to put Healey's translation in its original setting.

More valuable to the modern student is the Introduction which Sir Ernest Barker wrote in 1930 for an abridged edition of the *City of God*, and which is reprinted here. After describing the historical and philosophical background to the work, Sir Ernest Barker considers St Augustine's teaching on two main questions, "one concerning the State and its institutions in their relation to this distinction of the heavenly and the earthly cities; the other concerning the Church and its relation to the same distinction." He adds a valuable analysis of Book XIX, and he concludes with some remarks on the influence of the *City of God* on the subsequent history of theology. But this Introduction, however erudite, reveals the inevitable shortcomings of a reprint. Had it been written to-day, greater emphasis would probably have been laid upon St Augustine's conception of history as the scene of divine judgment, and of his vision of the Eternal City, by which vision alone mankind can be delivered from either Utopianism or despair.

Leslie E. Evans.

Liverpool Parish Church.

Christian Witness in the Post-War World: An Ecumenical Symposium. Edited by A. C. Craig and Hugh Martin. S.C.M. 3s. 6d.

This symposium is a fruit of the Religion and Life Movement. Since the book is presumably addressed to a public, many of whom have never attended, and possibly have never heard of, a Religion and Life Week, it would have been well to introduce it with a sober explanation and statement. Instead we have been given a swashbuckling "Introduction" from the pen of Dr Craig which defends the Movement against criticisms before the reader has learned what the Movement was or is. It is because the Religion and Life Movement was an aspect of the work of the British Council of Churches that the first essay, written by Dr Martin, gives a history of the Œcumenical Movement, while the second, by Dr Newton Flew, shows how large is the measure of common faith officially professed by all denominations. Mr Unwin then passes on to Christian social action. The Bishop of Bristol writes of education; the Dean of Chichester and Mr Muir of international affairs; and Canon McLeod Campbell of the local community, the congregation. One of the best essays is by Mr W. G. Symons on "The Obedience of the Individual Christian," an essay that would make an admirable basis for study and discussion in a "parish meeting." The Bishop of Sheffield writes of worship, and, if he says nothing very new, he does say some familiar things particularly well.

The symposium contains some suggestive writing. But it suffers seriously from the failure of the "Introduction" to make its pattern and its purpose clear. The essays are so short that no theme is adequately developed, and yet much that is familiar is retold. As papers at a conference these essays would be stimulating; as a book this symposium treats too many topics too slightly.

J. O. Cobham.

The Queen's College,
Birmingham.

Der Leib Christi (Σῶμα Χριστοῦ) *in den paulinischen Homologoumena und Antilegomena.* By Ernst Percy. Lunds Universitets Arsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 38. Nr. 1. 3 kr.

This is a very minute analysis of the Pauline doctrine of the Body of Christ. It suffers from the not uncommon weakness of attempting to treat St Paul as primarily a logical thinker and proceeding to interpret him in terms of either Jewish or Greek thought. But Paul was a hellenistic Jew, which means that he was ready to use every Greek or Jewish line of thought which would serve to express his faith; and his faith was not based on a system of philosophy, but on the facts of his experience. The result is that he will sometimes write as a Hebraist and sometimes as a Hellenist. Percy would deduce the Pauline conception of "being in Christ" from his conception of the new age that begins with Christ's death and resurrection. I can only

say that Deissmann's view that it is an expression of Paul's immediate personal experience, which he expects all converts to share, seems far preferable; the conception of the new age is one way of rationalizing that experience, just as the sharing of His death and resurrection is another.

As regards the conception of the Body of Christ, it seems easier to explain Paul's language as the adoption of the current Stoic view of the state as a body of which the citizens are members (in the literal sense, as in the speech of Menenius Agrippa); that the Church is the Body of Christ, not simply "a body" like the state, is the inevitable result of the position of Christ in the Apostle's whole scheme of things.

The position of Christ in Colossians and Ephesians again seems simply an adaptation of the view found in Seneca of the Emperor as the head or "mind" of the state, which is its body. Percy notices the text, but not its significance; he even notices Philo's reference in *Q. in Exod.* (Procopius 117) to the Logos as head of the universe, and ascribes it to "primitive Indo-Iranian" conceptions. It is simply the Stoic conception of the wise man as the head of the state, later identified with the deified monarch, who is not merely the head of the state, but the divine element of reason as manifested in the sphere of government. It is true that we never find a ruler in Greek described as the head of the state and the state described as his body. But where did Seneca get the idea from if not from popular Greek philosophy? We can rule out any idea that he invented it in view of the total lack of original thinking among the Romans.

But there is much valuable material in the pamphlet, notably in the statement (p. 43) that the Pauline conception of the being of the faithful in Christ is rooted ultimately in the thought of the representative self-sacrifice of Christ for our sake; this thought is the centre of the whole Pauline theology, from which alone it can be rightly understood.

Wilfred L. Knox.

Cambridge.

The Mission of the Church. By E. R. Morgan, Bishop of Southampton. The Centenary Press. 6s.

Personal Questionings of a Foreign Missions Enthusiast. By Garfield Williams, Dean of Manchester. Hodder and Stoughton. 3s. 6d.

The Anglican Church in India. By Eyre Chatterton, D.D., formerly Bishop of Nagpur. Indian Church Aid Association. 2s. 6d.

Each of these three missionary books is timely, yet altogether different. The Bishop of Southampton's book is theological, the Dean of Manchester's biographical, Bishop Chatterton's historical. The Bishop of Southampton sets out to provide a theology of missions for the present day which may take the place of the old dynamic which drove missionaries abroad to save millions of perish-

g souls. This he does by a study of the biblical and theological ackground of the mission of the Church. It is an enthralling sub- ct and there is much rich material in the book, the fruit, one nagines, of many deeply pondered addresses. Many suggestive lines thought are introduced. If there be a criticism, it is that the sub- ct is too vast for anything but popular treatment in a book of this ze. Less than a dozen pages per chapter, devoted to such themes the missionary nature of God (the doctrine of election), the ission of the Son, the mission of the Holy Spirit, the mission of the hurch, the relation of the Church to the Kingdom of God, its lation to the State, its eschatological character, its world-wide goal, s life as the creation of the Ascended Christ, and other subjects, oduces inevitably a terseness which at times reduces the subject most to lecture notes.

The Dean of Manchester's book is written in a light and auto- iographical style (it was originally delivered as popular lectures) nd gives a vivid picture of the romance of missions to those who ere young at the end of the last century. The Dean himself went to ndia in response to a cable to an S.C.M. conference ("Our student ovement looks to yours for leaders") and has clearly never lost his mantic enthusiasm. Yet in these reminiscences he manages not only o give us something of the thrill of missionary work and of the joy f the company of the saints that one meets in it (how many of us ould agree with his choice of Bishop Durrant of Lahore in par- cular), but also to challenge the missionary societies, as a result of is experiences, in at least two important respects: first, to a recon- deration of priorities, in which educational work, instead of being e Cinderella, shall be placed in the top category; and, secondly, to new relationship with the younger churches, in which overseas at ny rate the missionary societies shall entirely hand over control and roperty to the Church.

The third book, by Bishop Chatterton, is perhaps most apposite of ll at this moment. It recounts by means of brilliantly painted scenes nd stories the history of our Church in India from the days of the ast India Company onwards, and at a time when the British are oming to the end of their long rule over that country it pays tribute here tribute is due to "our own people in India; those who come ome again"—many of them never did; 500 died out of 2,000 in alcutta in one season!—and to "our own people in India; the nglo-Indian community," to whose loyalty to the Empire and past ervices to India full justice has never been done. The book also gives n admirable view of the extent of that Church's work by taking us n a tour of the dioceses, and concludes by pointing out that, with the ithdrawal not only of British rule but of establishment chaplains nd of grants towards salaries of clergy and upkeep of cathedrals and hurches and the probable heavy reduction of grants towards Anglo- ndian education, our Church in India and our Church schools, hese will need our help more than ever.

J. R. Peacey.

Bristol.

The Figure on the Cross. By R. H. Ward. S.P.C.K. for the Religiou Drama Society. 2s.

Here is a bold bid to produce religious drama of an unusual shap The play is in verse form, with no specific characters, setting, c costume, so that almost all its effect must come from the wor themselves as delivered by two men, one woman, and a chorus, i five "phases" (there are no curtained scenes). To maintain lines sufficient power to carry so much has clearly not been easy, and the are occasional weaknesses. But these are relatively few, and the pla the theme of which is the application of the seven words from th Cross to the sufferings of the modern world, is in a class well abo the general run of latter-day religious plays. The main difficulty would present to an amateur producer would be the finding of pa ticipants capable of speaking the lines adequately. In particula what the author calls the induction of the play could very easily b made to sound extremely obscure to an ordinary audience.

J. H. L. WATERSON.

RIPON.

Pagans Black and White. By Reginald Smith, C.R. Dacre Press. 4

The God of the Christians. By Dom Augustine Morris. Dacre Pres 5s.

And Then the Judgement. By Frank Biggart, C.R. Dacre Press. 4

The Why and Wherefore of the Church. By Andrew Blair, C.R Dacre Press. 2s. 6d.

A Living Faith for Living Men. By W. Norman Pittenger. Cloist Press. 75 cents.

It was perhaps unwise to refer to the *Tracts for the Times* in th general foreword to the Mirfield books and to claim that these ne little books are, in some sense, their successors. Such reference inevi ably invites comparison, and the Mirfield books can hardly claim t give a comparable presentation of tractarian theology for moder lay-folk. Little books may be divided roughly into three classes: firs works of limited compass, but of originality and profundity, throwin some new light or recovering some particular insight, as the origin tracts were for the most part; secondly, works of genuine simplific tion in which a discriminating mind makes great truths assimilab by simpler minds, perhaps the most necessary function of moder tracts for the times; lastly, works little in conception as well matter, when the subject and not just the presentation is reduced.

Fr Smith's book on the vocation of the Church, *Pagans Black an White,* is the only one of these books which has the making of a tra in the original sense. He makes some real thrusts prettily enough but with a faint air of boredom; indeed, we could wish for elabor tion of his theological and ascetical opening passes. He lets himse go more with the first-hand information he has to give about Churc

iscipline and education, and then tantalizingly leaves us in the air ith some shrewd comments on the Church and treatment of colour uestions. Church folk should be salutarily disturbed, unbelievers ay crow not so healthily.

Dom Augustine Morris's book, *The God of the Christians*, is un-oubtedly the best book of the series and is an admirable example of ne second category of little books. Dom Augustine answers many of ne questions and difficulties of ordinary lay-folk and clergy about ne doctrine of God by a clear exposition of traditional teaching quoting his saintly namesake advantageously) combined with some seful illustrations. Though always nicely philosophical, he makes it uite clear that God is the God of the Christians, not of the philo-ophers, and this book will induce not only straighter thinking, but lso better praying

On the doctrine of the Last Things and of the Church we could ell do with some little books of the second category, if not the first; ut *And Then the Judgement* and *The Why and Wherefore of the hurch* fall dangerously near the third class. Fr Biggart tries to clear p common misconceptions, but is not very illuminating. It is sur-rising that Fr Blair's book is the shortest of the series. It finds time o discuss dispensations from fasting communion, and yet does not ention the fact that the Church is the Body of Christ. Mirfield ight have been expected to produce a genuine tract for the times on he common life in the Body of Christ.

Mr Pittenger's little book from America would fit quite creditably nto the Mirfield series, though its style is rather more exuberant. his style, combined with some good illustrations, makes a forceful ittle book. It is definitely a little book, giving a general conspectus f the Catholic Faith and significantly makes practically no attempt o expound the Atonement. Yet its able treatment of Creation, the hurch, and the Sacraments reminds us of the riches of the Christian aith. Incidentally, it is interesting to find that this American book s more expensive and yet worse printed and produced than the andsome Mirfield books.

J. H. CHURCHILL.

CAMBERWELL.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: S. Radharkrishnan, *Religion and Society* (10s. 6d.).
GEOFFREY BLES: Douglas Edwards, C.R., *Jesus: The Gospel Portrait* (7s. 6d.); C. S. Lewis, *Miracles: A Preliminary Study* (10s. 6d.)
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Steven Runciman, *The Medieval Manichee* (15s.); J. H. Strawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy* (10s. 6d.)
CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS: *Evangelical Essentials* (2s. 6d.)
JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: W. C. G. Proctor, *Evangelical Thought and Practice* (5s.).

DENNIS DOBSON: Emmanuela Polemeni, *Léon Blay the Pauper Prophet, 1846–1917* (6s.); Luigi Sturzo, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (15s.); Albert Gleizes, *Life and Death of the Christian West* (7s. 6d.).

EAST AND WEST LIBRARY: Saadya Gaon, with an introduction and notes by Alexander Altmann, *The Book of Doctrines and Beliefs* (8s. 6d.).

EDITIONS DU SEUIL (PARIS): Yves Raguin, *Théologie Missionnaire de l'Ancien Testament* (n. p.).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS (LONDON: GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE): George P. Fedotov, *The Russian Religious Mind* (32s. 6d.).

HEFFER: T. G. Tuckey, *Building New Orders: Christian Essays in Social Reconstruction* (4s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York, *The Claims of the Church of England* (15s.).

I.C.F.: W. G. Peck, *The Healing of Man* (4d.).

I.V.F.: G. T. Manley (Ed.), *The New Bible Handbook* (10s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Spencer Leeson, *Christian Education* (15s.).

MENZIES AND CO. (EDINBURGH): D. Allan Easton, *Now's the Day: a Challenge to the Church of Scotland* (3s.).

PATHFINDER PRESS: *World Christian Digest*, Spring-Summer, 1947 (1s.).

PRESS AND PUBLICATIONS BOARD: Samuel Heaslett, *The Mind of Japan and the Religions of the Japanese* (2s.).

R.E.P.: Désirée Edwards-Rees, *Christianity and Adolescence* (4s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Douglas Stewart, *The Difficulty of Faith* (3s. 6d.); Alexander Miller, *Christian Vocation in the Contemporary World* (3s.); Theodore C. Wedel, *The Coming Great Church* (7s. 6d.); Hugh Martin (Ed.), *The Holy Communion* (6s.).

SOCIETY OF ST. WILLIBRORD: J. B. Dakin, *Saint Willibrord's Foundation and its Successors* (1s.).

S.P.C.K.: A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Christian Initiation* (1s.); George Every, *The Byzantine Patriarchate* (12s. 6d.); Henry R. T. Brandreth, *The Œcumenical Ideals of the Oxford Movement* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: M. H. Hazell, *How to Start a Speech Choir* (6d.); Aileen Henderson, *The Treasure Casket and Other Stories* (4s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher